

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following remarks is respectfully submitted.

Claims 1-23 are active in this application, Claims 1, 5, 7, 10-16, 18 and 20-23 having been amended by the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, and Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ali (6,801,594).

In response to the rejection based on 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> para., the claims have been rewritten to positively recite structure and to clarify the claimed terminology. The present amendments are believed to find support in the disclosure as originally filed, and are not believed to raise a question of new matter.

In response to the outstanding rejection on the merits, Claim 1 has been amended to include a feature derived from original Claim 2 and thus further recites --an attachment unit configured to attach and detach the operation unit to the bed--. Thus no new matter has been added by this further amendment to Claim 1.

In addition, Claims 22-23 have been amended to clarify that movement of at least one of the bed and the supporting unit in the determined movement direction is controlled using one of a wireless communication path and wired communication path. This change finds support in the original claims and in the disclosure as originally filed. Once again, no new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that Ali fails to disclose --an attachment unit configured to attach and detach the operation unit to the bed—as recited in amended Claim 1 and similarly recited in Claim 16. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-21 patentably define over Ali, and that the rejection of these claims as being unpatentable over Ali has been overcome.

Similarly, it is respectfully submitted that Ali fails to teach the provision of both a wireless communication path and a wired communication path in the context of an X-ray apparatus as claimed. Instead, Ali teaches a wireless communication path in the context of a CT apparatus. In fact, it is respectfully submitted that in an X-ray apparatus as claimed, it is typical that a large number of imaging operations are performed on a patient at one imaging session, which is not true of imaging using a CT apparatus. During a prolonged imaging session using the claimed X-ray imaging apparatus, convenience and flexibility of operation is promoted by the dual communication paths provided as claimed. In view of this distinction, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 22-23 likewise patentably define over Ali.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)